

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicant has submitted a proposed replacement sheet for drawing sheet 2 of 3 and an annotated sheet showing changes for sheet 2 of 3. Inadvertent text that was included in the drawing sheet as filed has been removed in the proposed replacement sheet. No other substantive changes were made. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to accept the proposed replacement sheet and to withdraw the objection.

The annotated sheet showing changes and the proposed replacement sheet are submitted herewith in the pages following this response.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 were pending, examined, and rejected. The Examiner objected to the drawings, the specification, and to certain claims. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 16-22 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Cheston (USPN 6,405,259). The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 8-15 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheston in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 8, 14, and 16 and canceled claims 2-3, 9-10, 13, 17-18. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, 14-16, and 19-22 remain pending.

Drawing Objection

The Office Action objected to FIG 2A as being unclear. Applicant submits herewith a proposed replacement drawing sheet and an annotated sheet showing changes for drawing sheet 2 of 3, which includes FIG 2A. The proposed replacement sheet eliminates unintended text that was included in FIG 2A as originally submitted. Applicants submit that the removal of unintended text does not constitute new matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the drawing objection.

The Office Action objected to the drawings as filed for failing to show claimed features, namely, a chassis, power supplies, and cooling fans recited in originally presented claim 13. In response, Applicant has canceled claim 13. Applicants submit that the objection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 13 and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Specification Objections

The Office Action objected to the specification for failing to provide antecedent support for claim 13's recitation of a cooling fan. Applicants submit that the cancellation of claim 13 renders the specification object moot and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claim objections

The Office Action objected to informalities in claims 2 and 6. Applicant has canceled claim 2 and amended claim 6 to address the claim objections.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 16-22 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Cheston (USPN 6,405,259).

In response to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of previously presented claims 2 and 3. Applicants traverse the anticipation rejection of claim 3 as originally presented and claim 1 as amended herein because the cited reference does not teach expressly or inherently where modifying WOL filters comprises including in each NIC in a partition a WOL filter corresponding to each of the MAC addresses of the other NICs in the partition such that a WOL packet addressed to any NIC in the partition is accepted by each NIC in the partition.

Rejecting claim 3 as originally presented, the Office Action states that Cheston teaches including in each NIC a WOL filter corresponding to each of the determined MAC addresses at column 6, lines 12-24 and column 6, lines 47-54. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Cheston merely describes modifying the WOL filters of each NIC to include a single common filter. In contrast, independent claim 1 as amended recites multiple filters including a filter corresponding to the MAC address of each NIC in a partition. Analogous remarks apply to the rejection of independent claim 16, which has been amended to include analogous limitations.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

With respect to the Section 103(a) rejection of independent claim 8, Applicants have amended to recite wherein each NIC in the partition comprises a plurality of WOL filters including a WOL filter corresponding to each NIC in the partition and wherein the plurality of WOL filters include a WOL filter corresponding to the media access control (MAC) address of each device in the set. For reasons analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 1,

Applicants submit that claim 8 as amended is allowable over the cited reference because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this response includes a reply to each ground of objection and rejection set forth in the Office Action. In light of the amendments made herein and the accompanying remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant would request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections, allow the pending claims, and advance the application to issue. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions, the undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference at 512.428.9872.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph P. Lally
Reg. No. 38,947
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

LALLY & LALLY, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 684749
Austin, Texas 78768-4749
512.428.9870
512.428.9871 (FAX)

JPL/mmm

Attachments

